

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 KIRSTEN HAYE, et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 vs.

14 IXIA HOLDINGS, LLC, et al,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. 1:20-cv-01810-DAD-JLT

**ORDER DENYING STIPULATION TO
EXTEND TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT
AS UNRIPE**

(Doc. 5)

17 The parties have stipulated to allow the defendants to respond to the complaint within ten days
18 after the Court rules on the motion to remand the matter to state court. However, there is no such
19 motion on calendar. Thus, the stipulation is DENIED as unripe¹.
20

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: **December 30, 2020**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26

27 ¹ If a motion to remand is filed and the parties again file a stipulation to extend the responsive pleading, the stipulation
28 SHALL demonstrate good cause for the delayed responsive pleading. At this time, the Court has no reason to believe that
filing a responsive pleading should be delayed because the motion to remand does not impact whether a responsive pleading
is needed.